



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,636	12/06/2001	Jurina Wessels	450117-03592	1870
20999	7590	11/03/2003	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			BAKER, MAURIE GARCIA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1639	3
DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/006,636	Applicant(s) Wessels et al	
	Examiner Maurie G. Baker	Art Unit 1639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ONE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claims 1-17 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some* c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
---	---

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a multifunctional linker molecule of structure CON₁-FUNC₁-X-FUNC₂-CON₂, classified variously depending on the specific structure of the molecule, for example, in any of class 544, 546, 548, subclasses various.
 - II. Claim 12, drawn to a particularly defined multifunctional linker molecule different in structure from Group I, classified in class 564, subclasses 155+.
 - III. Claim 13, drawn to particularly defined multifunctional linker molecules different in structure from Groups I & II, classified variously, for example, in classes 568 or 540, subclasses various.
 - IV. Claims 14-16, drawn to a 1-, 2-, or 3-dimensional assembly of nanostructured units, classified variously, for example, in class 438, subclasses various.
 - V. Claim 17, drawn to the use of an assembly of nanostructured units, classified variously, for example, in class 427, subclasses various.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
 3. Groups I – IV represent separate and distinct products. They differ in respect to their properties, their use and the synthetic methodology for making them. Therefore, they have different issues regarding patentability and enablement and represent patentably distinct subject matter. In the instant case, all of the products have different structures. First, the product of Group I has the structure CON₁-FUNC₁-X-FUNC₂-CON₂. The products of Groups II and III

have particularly defined structures that differ both from each other and from that set forth in Group I. Specifically with respect to Group I, the structures of Groups II and III do not contain groups reading on “CON₁” and “CON₂”. Group IV is different from any of Groups I – III because this product is defined as a “1-, 2-, or 3-dimensional assembly of nanostructured units”. The molecules of Groups I – III do not require any nanostructured units or 1-, 2-, or 3-dimensional assembly.

4. Groups IV and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product. That is, a use as “self-assembled electronic circuit elements, electrodes and metal coatings” could be carried out with a wide variety of assemblies of different structure (i.e. different from those set forth in the instant claims).

5. Groups I – III are not related to Group V. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, method of use of Group V utilizes a 1-, 2-, or 3-dimensional assembly of nanostructured units, not a multifunctional linker molecule, *per se*.

6. Therefore, the groups that describe these inventions each have different issues regarding patentability and enablement, and represent patentably distinct subject matter, which merits separate and burdensome searches. Art anticipating or rendering obvious each of the above-identified groups respectively would not necessarily anticipate or render obvious another group, because they are drawn to different inventions that have different distinguishing features and/or characteristics. Each group could support a separate patent.

7. These inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or divergent subject matter. The different inventions would require different searches in the patent and non-patent databases, and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Election of Species

8. This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention for **Groups I, III and IV**. Election is required as follows.

9. If applicant elects the invention of **Group I**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 1 is generic. Election is required as set forth below.

Species of multifunctional linker molecule

A *single, specific* species of “multifunctional linker molecule” should be elected, for purposes of search. The molecule should be completely defined, i.e. all variable groups (CON₁, FUNC₁, X, FUNC₂ and CON₂) delineated and linkages between them shown, resulting in the election of a single molecule.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. The different species would require different searches, thus creating an undue search burden.

10. If applicant elects the invention of **Group III**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 13 is generic. Election is required as set forth below.

Species of multifunctional linker molecule

A *single, specific* species of “multifunctional linker molecule” should be elected, for purposes of search. A single molecule should be elected from those set forth in the claim.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. The different species would require different searches, thus creating an undue search burden.

11. If applicant elects the invention of **Group IV**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 14 is generic. Election is required as set forth below.

Species of 1-, 2-, or 3-dimensional assembly of nanostructured units

A *single, specific* species of “1-, 2-, or 3-dimensional assembly of nanostructured units” should be elected, for purposes of search. The dimensionality and structure of the assembly should be delineated as well as the specific multifunctional linker molecule used in the assembly.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. The different species would require different searches, thus creating an undue search burden.

12. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

13. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and *a listing of all claims readable thereon*, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

14. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

15. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

16. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicants to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP § 812.01.

17. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

18. Applicant is also reminded that a 1 - month (not less than 30 days) shortened statutory period will be set for response when a written requirement is made without an action on the merits. This period may be extended under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Such action will not be an "action on the merits" for purposes of the second action final program, see MPEP 809.02(a).

Rejoinder

19. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP §

821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

20. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.

See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

21. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0065. The examiner is on an increased flextime schedule but can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 9:30 to 7:00.

23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Wang, can be reached at (703) 306-3217. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D.
October 16, 2003



MAURIE GARCIA BAKER, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER